

The 4th/5th January, 1972

No. 14890-4Lab-71/542.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Luk Auto Ancillary (India) Ltd., Faridabad:—

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 110 of 1970

Between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. LUK AUTO ANCILLARY (INDIA) LTD., FARIDABAD

Present:—Shri Darshan Singh for the workmen.

Shri S. L. Gupta for the management.

AWARD

The following disputes existing between the management of M/s. Luk Auto Ancillary (India) Ltd., Faridabad and their workmen were referred for adjudication to this Tribunal by the Governor of Haryana,—*vide* order No. ID/FD/299-A-70/23363-67, dated 3rd August, 1970, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

- (1) Whether workmen are entitled to the grant of D.A. ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
- (2) Whether workmen are entitled to the grant of annual increments ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

On receipt of the reference, the parties were called upon to put in their respective written statements. The statement of claim on behalf of the workmen was filed on 2nd September, 1970 reiterating the above demands. The management, in the written statement filed on 18th September, 1970, contested the above demands on merits and also questioned the *locus standi* of Faridabad Engineering Workers Union to raise the dispute. It was further urged that the dispute had not been properly espoused nor had it been raised according to the scheme of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The case has been heard on the following preliminary issues.

- (1) Whether Faridabad Engineering Workers Union has no *locus standi* to represent the workmen of the respondent factory because a substantial number of workmen of the respondent factory are not its members ?
- (2) Whether the present dispute has not been espoused by the workmen of the respondent factory ?
- (3) Whether the dispute has not been raised in accordance with the scheme of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 ?

The management has examined Shri Darshan Singh, President, Faridabad Engineering Workers Union as a witness in the case along with some record of the union which had given the demand notice. This record consists of the proceedings register containing the resolution dated 9th April, 1970 Exhibit M.W. 1/1, the letter of authority dated 2nd September, 1970 Exhibit M.W. 1/2.

Shri Darshan Singh has also come into the witness box on behalf of the concerned workmen as M.W. 1 and produced the membership form of the workers M.W. 1/1 to M.W. 1/41, counter files of the membership fee receipts M.W. 1/42 to M.W. 1/82 for the year, 1970 and counter files receipts Exhibit M.W. 1/83 to M.W. 1/124 for the year, 1969. The proceedings register of the union Exhibit M.W. 1/125.

The case has been argued on both sides and I have considered the facts on record. The main contention raised on behalf of the management is that the Faridabad Engineering Workers Union has no *locus standi* to raise any dispute on behalf of the workers of the present establishment not has the dispute been espoused by a substantial number of the workmen of the concern. Shri Darshan Singh, President of the union on whose behalf the demand notice leading to the present reference was given has been examined as a witness by the management with the relevant record of the union. He has also come into the witness box as M.W. 1 on behalf of the concerned workmen and placed on record some other documents including the membership form and the receipt of the payment of membership fee by the different workers as also the resolution dated 9th April, 1970 whereby he had authorised to raise the demands on the management. From the perusal of the entire record produced in the case and the statement of Shri Darshan Singh, however, it is not clear as to how many workers of the present establishment are

members of the union represented by him and who are those workers. The resolution dated 9th April, 1970 Exhibit M.W. 1/1 is not signed by any worker nor is there any mention in the said resolution as to how many workers of the present establishment had participated in the meeting when the said resolution was passed to authorise the union to raise the demand on the management. This resolution is signed only by Shri Darshan Singh. His statement made before the Tribunal both as a witness for the management and the workmen is also silent on this important point involved in this case. He has neither given the number of workmen of the present establishment who are members of the union represented by him nor the member or the names of the workmen of the present establishment who had allegedly participated in the meeting of 9th April, 1970 when a decision was taken to raise the demand on the management.

I have been referred to the authority letter dated 2nd September, 1970 Exhibit M.W. 1/2 on record which purports to have been signed by 46 workmen. A perusal of this authority letter would show that this was given to Shri Darshan Singh simply to authorise him to appear and conduct the case before this Tribunal on behalf of the signatories to the authority letter. It has been urged that the workmen had given another authority letter in favour of Shri Darshan Singh to raise the demands on the management which was presented to the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer along with the demand notice, that authority letter has not been produced. An adjournment had been obtained after arguments in the case to make an application for summoning the said authority letter from the office of the Labour Commissioner, Chandigarh but, for reasons not disclosed, no such application has been made nor has any body appeared on behalf of the workmen to pursue the case.

So taking into consideration the facts of the case discussed above, I am constrained to observe that the concerned workmen have failed to refute the contentions raised on behalf of the management that the Faridabad Engineering Workers Union has no representation from amongst the workmen of the present establishment and further that the demands, the subject matter of the present reference, have not been espoused by a substantial number of workmen of the establishment which was necessary to validate the reference. The learned representative of the workmen has not been able to satisfy me to the contrary. The contention raised by the management covered by the preliminary issues Nos. 1, 2 and 3 have, therefore, to prevail and the issues are accordingly decided against the workmen and in favour of the management.

The reference shall, in the result, stand rejected as being invalid for want of proper espousal of the dispute by the concerned workmen or their authorised union. In the circumstances, there shall be no order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 27th December, 1971.

No. 1584, dated the 27th December, 1971

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 27th December, 1971.

No. 14754-4Lab-71/544.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to Publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Continental Device India Ltd., Faridabad :—

BEFORE SHRI P.N. THUKRAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 12 of 1971

Between

The workman Shri Sahib Ram, c/o Faridabad Engineering Workers Union (Regd), Faridabad and the management of M/s Continental Device India Ltd., Faridabad

Present :

Shri Darshan Singh for the workman.

Shri C. M. Lal for the management.

AWARD

Shri Sahib Ram was in the service of M/s Continental Device India Ltd., Faridabad. His services were terminated by the management and this gave rise to an industrial dispute. Accordingly the Governor of Haryana was pleased to refer the following dispute to this Court for adjudication,—*vide* Government Gazette Notification No. ID/FD/543-B, dated 28th December, 1970 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sahib Ram was justified and in order ? If not ; to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the reference usual notices were issued to the parties in response to which a statement of claim was filed on behalf of the workman and the management filed their written statement. The workman maintains that he was a permanent employee in the respondent concern since 1966 and had a very clean record. It is alleged that on 11th May, 1970 when he reported for duty he was not allowed to work upon which he gave a demand notice dated 13th May, 1970 along with the copies to the Conciliation Officer, Faridabad, and on receipt of demand notice the management thought of issuing a charge sheet to cover up the illegality and issued a charge sheet on 13th May, 1970 which was received by the workman on 28th May, 1970 when he was on sick leave. It is alleged that this proves that the charges framed against the workman were totally wrong, baseless and after thought and in fact his services have been terminated without any notice of reason. The workman pleads that he replied to the charge sheet denying all the allegations made against him. The management appointed Shri R.N. Rai, their paid Legal Advisor to hold the enquiry and Shri Rai did not give any chance to the workman to defend himself not the copies of the enquiry proceedings were given to him. Copies of the findings were also not given to him. The termination of the services of the workman, is said to be illegal because a criminal case regarding the same incident was pending in the Court of A.D.M., Gurgaon and the management could not terminate the services of the workman during the pendency of a criminal case. The management in their written statement raised a number of preliminary objections but they were not pressed. On merits the case of the management is that on 8th May, 1970, the local police received information that the applicant Shri Sahib Ram has been stealing the property of the respondent company. Accordingly he was apprehended on the main road in the N.I.T., Faridabad while he was on the way to the market and recovered from him 300 devices (Semi-Conductor-Transistors) valued at about Rs 600 which was the property of the respondent company. It is pleaded that the applicant was charge-sheeted but he refused to accept the charge sheet and so it was sent to him by registered post which he also refused and ultimately he accepted the same on 28th May, 1970 and submitted his explanation which was not found satisfactory. so an enquiry was conducted by Shri R.N. Rai, Labour Law Advisor and his guilty was satisfactorily established and so the services of the workman was rightly terminated.

The only issue which arose from the pleadings of the parties was precisely the same as in the order of reference. The parties were given an opportunity to produce their evidence. The management examined their enquiry officer and thereafter the case was adjourned to 10th September, 1971 for the evidence of the workman because the workman was not present on the date fixed. Even on the adjourned date the workman was not present. It was stated that he was ill but no medical certificate was produced to prove the alleged illness. The case of the workman was, therefore, closed and the arguments of the parties were heard.

The main ground on which the validity of the domestic enquiry is challenged by the learned representative of the workman is that a criminal case was pending against the workman for the theft said to have been committed by him and, therefore, it was but fair that the domestic enquiry which was to cover the same ground should not have been held and the management should have waited for the conclusion of the criminal case. This proposition was contested on behalf of the management and reliance was placed upon an authority of the Supreme Court reported in 1965-II-LL-J-153. In this case two workmen of the company were caught while committing an act of theft in respect of the property of the company. The workmen were put up for trial on the charge of theft before Magistrate. The management did not hold the managerial enquiry during the pendency of the trial. The workmen were convicted by the Magistrate and they filed an appeal against their conviction and while the appeal was pending, the management started the managerial enquiry. The workmen requested for stay of proceedings which was not accepted they were dismissed as a result of the findings of the Enquiry Officer. The appeal of the workmen was accepted and they were acquitted of the charge of theft. After the acquittal the workmen applied for re-instatement but the management refused to re-instate them. Thereupon the workmen raised an industrial dispute which was referred for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal. The Tribunal upheld the contention of the workmen that they were entitled to be re-instated in view of the fact that they had been acquitted of the charge of theft. The management filed an appeal before the Labour Appellate Tribunal which was rejected, upon which the management filed an appeal before Supreme Court. Their Lordship of the Supreme Court accepted the appeal and were pleased to lay down that "the principles of natural justice do not require that the employer must wait for the decision of a criminal case or an appeal before proceeding with a domestic enquiry.

In view of the Supreme Court authority quoted above, it is not possible to accept the contention of the learned representative of the workman that the enquiry is vitiated because the management did not postpone the enquiry till the conclusion of the criminal trial. I am further of the opinion that the present case is much weaker than the case before the Supreme Court because in the Supreme Court case the appeal of the workmen was accepted and they were acquitted of the charge of theft, while in the present case there is no evidence that the workman has been acquitted in the criminal case.

The second ground on which the validity of the enquiry is challenged is that before the proceedings started the workman requested the management to supply him with a list of the witnesses who were to be examined against him but this request was not accepted and for this reason the workman has been prejudiced in his defence. While I agree with the general observations of the learned representative of the workman that the management should not have played the game of hide and seek with the workman and there should have been no objection to supply the workman with a list of the witnesses who were to be examined but it would not be proper to set aside the enquiry simply on this technical ground because the workman has led no evidence to prove that he was in fact prejudiced in his defence because the list of the witnesses was not supplied to him. In fact the workman has not even bothered to appear as witness or to produce any defence although two opportunities were given to him.

The learned representative of the workman has also submitted that the workman requested for supply of copies of some documents which were not supplied to him but it can not be said that the workman has been prejudiced because the management permitted the workman to inspect the record of the enquiry and to take copies of any documents he desired.

No other grounds were urged by the learned representative of the workman and after carefully considering the submission, I am unable to agree with him that the domestic enquiry is in any way vitiated. The dismissal of the workman cannot, therefore, be said to be unjustified and he is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. There will be no order as to costs.

The 21st December, 1971.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 2510, dated Rohtak the 21st December, 1971

Forwarded in quadruplicate to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

P. N. THUKRAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana, Rohtak.

No. 14798-4Lab-71/546.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of Messrs Hindustan Vacuum Glass Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 4 of 1971

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS HINDUSTAN VACUUM GLASS LTD.,
FARIDABAD

Present:

Nemo for the workmen.

Shri C.M. Lal and Shri N. Dutta for the management.

AWARD

The Governor of Haryana, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred for adjudication to this Tribunal the following dispute between Messrs Hindustan Vacuum Glass Ltd., Faridabad, and its workmen,—*vide* Order No. ID/FD/567-B/2842-46, dated 21st January, 1971 :—

1. Whether the workmen are entitled to the payment of Bonus at a rate higher than 4 per cent minimum, already paid under the Payment of Bonus Act for the year 1969 ? If so, with what details ?

2. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of Dearness Allowance and whether it should be linked with the cost of Living Index Numbers ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
3. Whether Uniforms should be supplied to the workmen ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
4. Whether any gratuity scheme should be introduced for the workmen ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

On receipt of the reference, usual notices were given to the parties and they filed their respective written statement. The workmen in the statement of claim reiterated their demands, the subject-matter of the reference. The management, on the other hand, contested the above demand and raised several preliminary objections. The following issues arose for determination in the case:—

1. Whether the Glass and Ceramics Workers Union, Faridabad, has *locus standi* to raise the present dispute ?
2. Whether the present dispute has been properly espoused ?
3. Whether the demands under reference were raised direct on the management ? If not, with what effect ?
4. Whether the demand with regard to the payment of Bonus at a rate higher than 4 per cent for the year 1969 cannot be adjudicated upon in as much as the company does not have any financial year as 1969 ?
5. Whether the demand for grant of dearness allowance is vague ? If so, with what effect ?
6. What is the effect of the award, dated 26th November, 1965, in reference No. 28 of 1965 and award, dated 20th May, 1967, in reference No. 34 of 1967 on the present demands of the workmen ?
7. Whether the workmen are entitled to the payment of Bonus at a rate higher than 4 per cent minimum already paid under the Payment of Bonus Act for the year 1969 ? If so, with what details ?
8. Whether the workmen are entitled to the grant of dearness allowance and whether it should be linked with the Cost of Living Index Numbers ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
9. Whether Uniforms should be supplied to the workmen ? If so, with what details and from which date ?
10. Whether any gratuity scheme should be introduced for the workmen ? If so, with what details and from which date ?

Several adjournments have been given for the evidence of the workmen on the preliminary issues Nos. 1, 2, 3 but no evidence has been produced. None of the workmen has come forward to make his statement to refute the contentions raised on behalf of the management that the Glass and Ceramics Workers Union, Faridabad, had no *locus standi* to raise the disputes, the subject-matter of the present reference, and that the demands in question had not been first raised on the management and rejected by it before taking up the matter to the Conciliation Officer which was necessary according to the rule of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Sindhu Resettlement Corporation case. The management had raised a still further plea that the present dispute had not been properly espoused. The workmen have led no evidence whatever to indicate that the dispute had been espoused by a substantial number of workmen of the present establishment. The relevant record of the union is not forthcoming. The demand notice which has been received along with the reference purports to have been given by Shri Darshan Singh, General Secretary of the said union. He has also failed to come into the witness box to refute the above pleas of the management and has further chosen not to appear and conduct the case for the workmen.

It will not be out of place to mention here that according to an assertion made in the written statement the Glass and Ceramics Workers Union, Faridabad, had made an application for being impleaded as a party in another dispute reference No. 27 of 1969 pending between the management of Messrs Hindustan Vacuum Glass Ltd., Faridabad, and their workmen but their request had been disallowed by my learned predecessor,—*vide* order dated 7th January, 1970.

In view of the facts stated above, the preliminary issue Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are decided against the workmen. The reference shall, in the result, stand rejected as being invalid. The award is made accordingly. In the circumstances there shall be no order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No: 1583, dated the 27th December, 1971

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated 27th December, 1971.

O. P. SHARMA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

B.L. AHUJA,
Commissioner for Labour and Employment and Secy.

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

(URBAN ESTATES)

The 7th January, 1972

No. L.A.C./NTLA-71/3684.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for planned development in the area of Village Hissar, Hadbast No. 146, Tehsil and District Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

Plan of the land may be inspected in the Offices of the following :—

(1) Director, Urban Estate, Kothi No. 231, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.

(2) Deputy Commissioner, Hissar.

(3) Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula), Urban Estate, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Haryana, Chandigarh.

(4) Tehsildar, Hissar.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the Officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested in the above land, who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date on which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula), Urban Estate, Haryana, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
Hissar	Hissar	Hissar, Hadbast No. 146	400.96	5484, 5485, 5485/1, 5486, 5487, 5488, 5489, 5490, 5491, 5492, 5493, 5494, 5495, 5496, 5497, 5498, 5499, 5500, 5501, 5502, 5503, 5504, 5505, 5506, 5507, 5508, 5509, 5510, 5511, 5512, 5513, 5514, 5515, 5516, 5517, 5518, 5519, 5520, 5521, 5522, 5523, 5524, 5525, 5526, 5527, 5528, 5529, 5530, 5531, 5532, 5533, 5534, 5535, 5536, 5537, 5538, 5539, 5540, 5541, 5542, 5543, 5544, 5545, 5546, 5547, 5548, 5549, 5550, 5551, 5552, 5553,

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in Acres	Khasra Nos.
				5554, 5555, 5556, 5556/1, 5557, 5558, 5559, 5560, 5561, 5562, 5563, 5564, 5564/1, 5565, 5566, 5567, 5568, 5569, 5569/1, 5570, 5570/1, 5571, 5572, 5573, 5574, 5575, 5575/1, 5576, 5577, 5578, 5579, 5580, 5581, 5582, 5583, 5584, 5585, 5586, 5587, 5588, 5589, 5590, 5591, 5592, 5593, 5594, 5595, 5596, 5597, 5598, 5599, 5600, 5601, 5602, 5603, 5604, 5605, 5606, 5607, 5608, 5609, 5610, 5611, 5612, 5613, 5614, 5615, 5616, 5617, 5618, 5619, 5620, 5621, 5622, 5623, 5624, 5625, 5626, 5627, 5628, 5629, 5630, 5631, 5632, 5633, 5634, 5634/1, 5635, 5635/1, 5636, 5637, 5638, 5639, 5640, 5641, 5642, 5643, 5644, 5645, 5646, 5647, 5648, 5649, 5650, 5651, 5652, 5653, 5654, 5655, 5656, 5657, 5658, 5659, 5660, 5661, 5662, 5663, 5664, 5665, 5666, 5667, 5668, 5669, 5670, 5671, 5672, 5673, 5674, 5675, 5676, 5677, 5678, 5679, 5680, 5681, 5682, 5683, 5684, 5685, 5686, 5687, 5688, 5689, 5690, 5691-5692/1, 5691-92/2, 5691-92/3, 5691-92/4, 5691-92/5, 5691-92/6, 5691-92/7, 5691-92/8, 5691-92/9, 5691-92/10, 5691-92/11, 5691-92/12, 5691-92/13, 5691-92/14, 5691-92/15, 5691-92/15, 5691-92/17, 5691-92/18, 5691-92/19, 5691-92/20, 5691-92/21, 5691-92/22, 5691-92/23, 5691-92/24, 5691-92/25, 5691-92/26, 5691-92/27, 5691-92/28, 5691-92/29, 5691-92/30, 5691-92/31, 5691-92/32, 5691-92/ 33, 5691-92/34, 5691-92/35, 5691-92/36, 5691-92/37, 5691-92/38, 5691-92/39, 5691-92/40, 5691-92/41, 5691-92/42, 5691-92/43, 5691-92/44, 5691-92/45, 5691-92/46, 5691-92/ 47, 5691-92/48, 5691-92/49, 5691-92/50, 5691-92/51, 5691-92/52, 5691-92/53, 5691-92/ 54, 5691-92/55, 5691-92/56, 5691-92/57, 5691-92/58, 5691-92/59, 5691-92/60, 5691-92/ 61, 5691-92/62, 5691-92/63, 5691-92/64, 5691-92/65, 5691-92/66, 5691-92/67, 5691-92/ 68, 5691-92/69, 5691-92/70, 5691-92/71, 5691- 92/72, 5691-92/73, 5691-92/74, 5691-92/75, 5691-92/76, 5691-92/77, 5693, 5693/1, 5693/2, 5693/3, 5693/4, 5694, 5696, 5698, 5699, 5700, 5701, 5702, 5703, 5704, 5705, 5706, 5707, 5708, 5709, 5710, 5711, 5712, 5713, 5714, 5715, 5716, 5717, 5718, 5719, 5720, 5721, 5722, 5723, 5724, 5725, 5726, 5727, 5728, 5729, 5730, 5731, 5732, 5733, 5734, 5735, 5736, 5737, 5738, 5739, 5740, 5741, 5742, 5743, 5744, 5745, 5746, 5747, 5748, 5749, 5750, 5751, 5752, 5753, 5754, 5755, 5756, 5760, 5761, 5764, 5765, 5766, 5767, 5783, 5788, 5789, 5790, 5791, 5792, 5793, 5793/1, 5794, 5795, 5796, 5798, 5799, 5800, 5801, 5802, 5803, 5804, 5805, 5806, 5807, 5708, 5809, 5810, 5811, 5812, 5913, 5814, 5815, 5816, 5817, 5818, 5819, 5820, 5821, 5822, 5823, 5824, 5825, 5826, 5827, 5728, 5829, 5830, 5831, 5832, 5833, 5834, 5835, 5836, 5837, 5838, 5839, 5840, 5841, 5842, 5843, 5844, 5845, 5846, 5847, 5848, 5849, 5850, 5851, 5852, 5853, 5854, 5855, 5856, 5857, 5858, 5859, 5860, 5861, 5862, 5863, 5864, 5865, 5866, 5867, 5868

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra Nos.
				5869, 5870, 5871, 5872, 5873, 5874, 5875, 5876, 5877, 5878, 5879, 5880, 5881, 5882, 5883, 5884, 5885, 5888, 5886, 5887, 5889, 5890, 5891, 5892, 5893, 5894, 5895, 5896, 597, 5898, 5899, 5903, 5904, 5905, 5906, 5907, 5908, 5909, 5910, 5911, 5912, 5913, 5914, 5915, 5916, 5917, 5918, 5919, 5920, 5921, 5922, 5923, 5924, 5925, 5926, 5927, 5928, 5929, 5930, 5931, 5932, 5933, 5934, 5935, 5936, 5937, 5937/1, 5938, 5939, 5940, 5941, 5942, 5943, 5944, 5945, 5946, 5947, 5948, 5949, 5950, 5951, 5952, 5953, 5955, 5956, 5957, 5958, 5959, 5960/1, 5959/1, 5959/2, 5959/3, 5959/4, 5960/2, 5960/3, 5960/4, 5961, 5962, 5963, 5970

No. L.A.C./NTLA-71/3685.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for planned development in the area of Village Satror Khas, Hadbast No. 154, Tehsil and District Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

Plan of the land may be inspected in the Offices of the following :—

- (1) Director, Urban Estates, Kothi No. 231, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.
- (2) Deputy Commissioner, Hissar.
- (3) Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula) Urban Estate, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.
- (4) Tehsildar, Hissar.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid Section the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to authorise the Officers for the time being engaged in the under taking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that Section.

Any person interested in the above land, who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date of which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula) Urban Estate, Haryana, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in Acres	Rectangle/Khasra Nos.
Hissar	Hissar	Satror Khas, Hadbast No. 154	0.79	39/22 and Khasra No. 290/1

No. L.A.C./NTLA-71/3686.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government, at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for planned development in the area of village Hissar, Hadbast No. 146, Tehsil and District Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

Plan of the land may be inspected in the Offices of the following :—

- (1) Director, Urban Estate, Kothi No. 231, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.
- (2) Deputy Commissioner, Hissar.
- (3) Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula) Urban Estate, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Haryana Chandigarh. *
- (4) Tehsildar, Hissar.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid Section the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to authorise the Officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that Section.

Any person interested in the above land, who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date on which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula) Urban Estate, Haryana, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Had'bast No.	Area in acres	Khasra No.
Hissar	.. Hissar	.. Hissar, Had'bast No. 146	297.62	4782, 4783, 4923 Min North, 4926, 4927, 4928, 4929, 4931, 4932, 4933, 4934, 4935, 4936, 4937, 4938, 4939, 4940, 4941, 4942, 4943, 4944, 4945, 4946, 4947, 4948, 4949, 4950, 4951, 4952, 4953, 4954, 4955, 4956, 4959, 4960, 4961, 4962, 4963, 4964, 4965, 4966, 4967, 4968, 4969, 4970, 4971, 4972, 4973, 4974, 4975, 4976, 4977, 4978, 4979, 4980, 4981, 4982, 4983, 4984, 4985, 4986, 4987 Min South, 4988 Min South-West, 4990 Min West, 4991, 4992, 4993, 4994, 4995, 4996, 4997, 4998, 4999, 5000, 5001, 5002, 5003, 5004, 5005, 5006, 5007, 5008, 5009, 5010, 5011, 5012, 5013, 5014, 5015, 5016, 5017, 5018, 5019, 5020, 5021, 5022, 5023, 5024, 5025, 5026, 5027, 5028, 5029, 5030, 5031, 5032, 5033, 5034, 5035, 5036, 5037, 5038, 5039, 5040.. Min East, 5041, Min East, 5042, 5043.. Min East, 5044, 5045, 5046, 5047, 5048, 5049, 5050, 5051, 5052, 5053, 5055, 5054, 5056, 5057, 5058, 5059, 5060, 5061, 5062, 5063, 5064, 5065, 5066, 5067, 5068, 5069, 5070, 5071, 5072, 5073, 5074, 5075, 5076, 5077, 5078, 5079, 5080, 5081, 5082, 5083, 5084, 5085, 5086, 5087, 5088, 5089, 5091, 5094, 5095, 5096 Min West, 5101, 5105, 5106, 5107, 5108, 5109, 5143, 5144, 5145, 5146, 5199, Min East, 5202 Min East, 5204, 5208, 5209, 5210, 5211, 5212, 5213, 5214, 5215, 5216, 5217, 5218, 5219, 5220, 5221, 5222, 5223, 5224, 5225, 5226, 5226/1, 5227, 5228, 5229, 5230, 5231, 5232, 5233, 5234, 5235, 5236, 5237, 5238, 5239, 5240, 5241, 5242, 5243, 5244, 5245, 5246, 5247, 5248, 5249, 5252 Min West-South, 5253 Min East, 5254 Min East-South, 5255, 5256, 5257, 5258, 5259, 5260, 5261, 5262 Min East-West, 5263 Min East, 5264, 5265, 5266, 5267, 5268, 5269, 5270, 5271, 5272, 5273, 5274, 5275 Min East-South.

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Khasra No.
Hissar—coo cl	Hissar—con cl	Hissar, Hadbast No. 146—con cl	297.62—	5276, 5277, 5278, 2579/1, 5279/2, 5280, 5281, 5282, 5283, 5284, 5285, 5286, 5287, 5288, 5289, 5290, 5291, 5292, 5296, 5297, 5298, 5301, 5302, 5303, 5304, 5305, 5306, 5307, 5308, 5309, 5310, 5311, 5312, 5340, 5341, 5342, 5343, 5344, 5345, 5346, 5347, 5364, 5366, 5368, 5369, 5370, 5371, 5372, 5373, 7374, 5375, 5376, 5377, 5378, 5379, 5380, 5381, 5382, 5383, 5384, 5385, 5386, Min South, 5387 Min South, 5388, 5389, Min South, 5390 Min South, 5391, 5392, 5393, 5394 Min South, 5395, 5396, 5397, 5398, 5399, 5400, 5401, 5402, 5403, 5404, 5405, 5406, 5407, 5408, 5409, 5410, 5411, 5412, 5413, 5414, 5415, 5416, 5417, 5418, 5419, 5420, 5421, 5422, 5423, 5424, 5425, 5426, 5427, 5428, 5429, 5430, 5431, 5432, 5433, 5434, 5435, 5436 Min South, 5438 Min West, 5439 Min South, 5440, Min West, 5441, 5442 Min West, 5443 Min West, 4552 Min West, 5453 Min West, 5471 Min South, 5472 Min South, 5473 Min South, 5475 Min East, 5476, 5477 Min East, 5478 Min East, 5481 Min East, 5482.

No. L.A.C./NTLA-71/3687.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for planned development in the area of village Satror Khas, Hadbast No. 154, Tehsil and District Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

Plan of the land may be inspected in the Offices of the following :—

- (1) Director Urban Estate, Kothi No. 231, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.
- (2) Deputy Commissioner, Hissar.
- (3) Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula) Urban Estate, Kothi No. 224, Section 18-A, Haryana, Chandigarh.
- (4) Tehsildar, Hissar.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to authorise the Officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that Section.

Any person interested in the above land, who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date on which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality, file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector (Panchkula), Urban Estate, Haryana, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Killa No.
Hissar	Hissar	Satrur Khas Hadbast No. 154	14.33	118 1/1, 1/2, 10/1, 10/2, 11/1

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Killa No.
Hissar—concl'd	Hissar—covcl'd			118
			11/2, 19/1/1, 19/1/2, 19/1 118	20/1, 20/2, 21/1, 119
			21/2, 22	5, 6, 15, 16 121
			16, 25/1, 25/2	122
			19, 20, 21/1, 21/2, 22	

No. L.A.C./NTLA-71/3688.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government at public expense, for a public purpose, namely, for planned development in the area of Village Satror Khurd, Hadbast No. 155, Tehsil and District Hissar, it is hereby notified that the land described in the specification below is required for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

Plan of the land may be inspected in the Offices of the following :—

- (1) Director, Urban Estate, Kothi No. 231, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.
- (2) Deputy Commissioner, Hissar.
- (3) Land Acquisition Collector(Panchkula) Urban Estate, Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Haryana, Chandigarh.
- (4) Tehsildar, Hissar.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana, is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested in the above land, who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date on which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, (Panchkula) Urban Estate, Haryana Kothi No. 224, Sector 18-A, Chandigarh.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/Village and Hadbast No.	Area in acres	Rectangle/Killa No.
Hissar	Hissar	Satror Khurd Hadbast No. 155	39.56	119
			14, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 120	
			6, 15, 16, 24, 25	121
			1/1, 1/2, 2/1, 2/2, 4/1, 3, 4/2, 4/3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15/1, 15/2, 17, 18, 19/1, 19/2, 20, 21/1, 21/2, 22, 23/1, 23/2, 24 122	
			1, 2, 9, 11, 12, 10 and Khasra No. 338 Min and 908 Min.	